

Docket No. 13382-US-PA  
US App. No. 10/810,090

## REMARKS

### Status of the Application

Claims 1-17 were previously pending.

Claim 1 was objected to for informalities. Claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Kobayashi et al. (US 6,741,223). Claims 4 and 5 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi et al. Claims 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi et al. as applied to claim 3, and in view of Menig et al. (US 6,289,332). Claim 8 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi et al. as applied to claim 3, and in view of Breed et al. (US 5,845,000). Claims 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi et al. as applied to claim 1, and in view of Okuyama et al. (US 5,677,701). Claims 13-17 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi et al. as applied to claim 1, and in view of Parker et al. (US 6,886,956).

Claims 11-12 were objected to for being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim.

Applicant has amended claims 1 and 3, and added new claim 18. No new matter adds through the amendments. For the reasons discussed below, withdrawal of the objections and rejections is requested.

### Claim Objections

Claim 1 was objected to for informalities.

Claim 1 has been amended to correct the informalities. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

### Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Applicant has carefully reviewed and amended claim 1. It is believed the amendments made to claim 1 has overcome the rejections.

Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Docket No. 13382-US-PA  
US App. No. 10/810,090

**Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. 102(e)**

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Kobayashi et al. (US 6,741,223).

Applicant has amended claim 1 to more clearly define the invention. The amended claim 1 reads as:

1. An information displaying apparatus for a vehicle, comprising:  
a cluster disposed to face an occupant;  
a display device disposed in said cluster; and  
***a display controlling portion configured to control said display device;***  
said display device including a displaying surface which displays vehicle information;  
and  
a plurality of reflecting mirror members which are disposed in said cluster and are disposed to have a distance from each other;  
wherein said vehicle information is reflected by the plurality of a reflecting mirror members to be visible by the occupant;  
wherein the plurality of reflecting mirror members include a first reflecting mirror member which is provided far from the occupant and a second reflecting mirror member which is provided near to the occupant;  
wherein the vehicle information reflected by the first reflecting mirror member is visible by the occupant by being transmitted through the second reflecting mirror member; and  
***wherein said display controlling portion controls the display device such that the vehicle information reflected by the second reflecting mirror member is visible to be more enlarged than the vehicle information reflected by the first reflecting mirror member.***

Kobayashi at least does not teach or suggest the above emphasized feature of claim 1. As recited in the amended claim 1, the information displaying apparatus of the present invention comprises a display controlling portion, "***wherein said display controlling portion controls the display device such that the vehicle information reflected by the second reflecting mirror member is visible to be more enlarged than the vehicle information reflected by the first reflecting mirror member.***" Kobayashi is totally silent about displaying an enlarged view of vehicle information.

As described in paragraph [0060] of the specification, "the fuel gauge displaying 22 and the coolant temperature gauge displaying 23 are displayed at the proximity of periphery of left and right edges of the farthest mirror member 19 in a normal condition as shown by a two-dot chain line in FIG. 1. However, if there is a necessity of call the occupant's attention such as the

Docket No. 13382-US-PA  
US App. No. 10/810,090

reduction in the remaining amount of fuel and the rise in the water temperature, the fuel gauge displaying and the coolant temperature gauge displaying are to be displayed at the position nearest to the occupant with relatively large size as a warning display, thus it is possible to call the occupant's attention". This display of enlarged vehicle information is controlled by the display controlling portion according to a predetermined criterion such as the reduction in the remaining amount of fuel and the rise in the water temperature.

Kobayashi teaches a display device including a display unit capable of displaying a three dimensional image by shifting the position of a real image and a virtual image in a front and back direction, and a total control unit for controlling a display content of the display unit. In Kobayashi, a display control unit 32 is provided for controlling the display content displayed by a display unit 12. Col. 8, lines 6-33. But, the display control unit 32 does not control the enlargement of the displayed vehicle information.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Kobayashi cannot anticipate claims 1-3. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

**Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

Claims 4 and 5 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi et al.

For the reasons discussed above, claims 1 and 3 are believed patentable over Kobayashi et al.. Claims 4-5 depend on claim 3 and, therefore, are also patentable over Kobayashi et al..

Claims 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi et al. as applied to claim 3, and in view of Menig et al. (US 6,289,332).

Menig teaches a message system for a vehicle which provides an extendable, prioritized message scheme. As shown in Fig. 9 and described on Col. 12, lines 4-24, Menig teaches that "[a]s the closing time between the truck and the obstacle reaches predetermined values associated with each stage, the message center displays a progressively larger triangle and the words, "DANGER

Docket No. 13382-US-PA  
US App. No. 10/810,090

AHEAD". However, Menig does not teach that *"the vehicle information reflected by the second reflecting mirror member is visible to be more enlarged than the vehicle information reflected by the first reflecting mirror member"* as recited in claim 1. Indeed, Menig is totally silent about the reflecting mirror members.

Therefore, the combination of Kobayashi and Menig cannot render obvious the amended claim 1. Claims 6-7 indirectly depend on claim 1 and, thus, are patentable over Kobayashi and Menig for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

In addition, claims 6 and 7 contain features that further distinguish over Kobayashi and Menig. For example, claim 6 recites "the ETC approximation-notification display is reflected and displayed on the reflecting mirror member provided far from the occupant when the ETC gate is far away from the vehicle, and the ETC approximation-notification display is reflected and displayed on the reflecting mirror member provided near to the occupant when the vehicle approaches toward the ETC gate". Neither Kobayashi nor Menig teaches or suggests that the ETC display is reflected and displayed on different reflecting mirror members as the distance from the ETC to the vehicle changes.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi et al. as applied to claim 3, and in view of Breed et al. (US 5,845,000).

Breed was cited to teach an eyepoint detecting means for detecting an eyepoint of the occupant. However, Breed clearly cannot cure the deficiencies of Kobayashi as discussed above in connection with claim 1. More specifically, Breed does not teach or suggest *"the vehicle information reflected by the second reflecting mirror member is visible to be more enlarged than the vehicle information reflected by the first reflecting mirror member"* as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, the combination of Kobayashi and Breed cannot render obvious the amended claim 1. Claim 8 indirectly depends on claim 1 and, thus, is patentable over Kobayashi and Breed for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Docket No. 13382-US-PA  
US App. No. 10/810,090

Claims 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi et al. as applied to claim 1, and in view of Okuyama et al. (US 5,677,701).

Okuyama was cited to teach a rotational lid member for opening and closing an area of the cluster and a cover member provided in the cluster (claim 9) and to teach an interlocking mechanism for interlocking an erecting operation of the reflecting mirror member (claim 10).

However, Okuyama clearly cannot cure the deficiencies of Kobayashi as discussed above in connection with claim 1. More specifically, Okuyama does not teach or suggest *"the vehicle information reflected by the second reflecting mirror member is visible to be more enlarged than the vehicle information reflected by the first reflecting mirror member"* as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, the combination of Kobayashi and Okuyama cannot render obvious the amended claim 1. Claims 9-10 depend on claim 1 and, thus, is patentable over Kobayashi and Okuyama for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 13-17 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi et al. as applied to claim 1, and in view of Parker et al. (US 6,886,956).

Parker was cited to provide the elements in claims 13-17 that are missing from Kobayashi.

However, Parker clearly cannot cure the deficiencies of Kobayashi as discussed above in connection with claim 1. More specifically, Parker does not teach or suggest *"the vehicle information reflected by the second reflecting mirror member is visible to be more enlarged than the vehicle information reflected by the first reflecting mirror member"* as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, the combination of Kobayashi and Parker cannot render obvious the amended claim 1. Claims 13-17 depend on claim 1 and, thus, is patentable over Kobayashi and Parker for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner is thanked for pointing out that claims 11-12 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Docket No. 13382-US-PA  
US App. No. 10/810,090

As Applicants believe that claim 1 is now patentable, no amendments are made to claims 11-12.

**New Claims**

New dependent claim 18 is added to more fully protect the present invention.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims 1-18 are now in condition for allowance. Allowance of this application is earnestly solicited.

Respectively submitted  
J.C. PATENTS

Date: 9-11-2007

4 Venture, Suite 250  
Irvine, CA 92618  
Tel.: (949) 660-0761

  
Jiawei Huang  
Registration No. 43,330